

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed April 25, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on December 12, 2003; July 20, 2005; and November 3, 2005.

Claims 1-9, 17 and 18 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. The Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claim 2 (page 4, Paper No. 042106). Claims 1, 2, 7, 17 and 18 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention, and new dependent claims 19-21 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. Accordingly, claims 1-9 and 17-21 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 7, 17 and 18 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 4 of the Official Action rejects claims 1, 3-9, 17 and 18 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0004434 to Nishi. The Applicant respectfully submits that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 18 have been amended to recite one of the features from allowed claim 2. Specifically, the independent claims have been amended to recite that the second sealing material is applied at least to a central part of the pixel portion and to a position surrounding the central part. The Applicant

respectfully submits that Nishi does not teach the above-referenced features of the present invention, either explicitly or inherently.

Since Nishi does not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are in order and respectfully requested.

New dependent claims 19-21 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. The features of claims 19-21 are supported in the present specification, for example, at page 4, lines 2-7, and Figure 1A. For the reasons stated above and already of record, the Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 19-21 are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789